

100200239-1

10/052,612

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed February 11, 2005. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By the forgoing amendment, the specification and various claims have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 22-29 have been added. Thus, claims 1-29 are currently pending for action.

§ 112, Second Paragraph:

The outstanding Office Action rejected claims 5, 6, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. These claims have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's comments, but are thought to have been proper and in compliance with § 112 as originally filed. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has herein amended claims 5, 6 and 15 to further clarify the language objected to in the Office Action. Following this amendment, Applicant believes that claims 5, 6 and 15 will be held to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Prior Art:

With regard to the prior art, claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17 and 21 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,110 to Motoyama ("Motoyama"). The other dependent claims were rejected under § 103 in full or partial reliance on Motoyama. For at least the following reasons, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

100200239-1

10/052,612

Claim 1 recites

A computer network for providing services comprising:
a plurality of computing elements each of which comprises computing resources for supporting one or more services; and
a redirector, communicatively connected to each of said computing elements, configured to serve as an email proxy for said plurality of computing elements;
wherein said services are controlled by email messages routed by said redirector among said plurality of computing elements.
(emphasis added).

Independent claim 11 similarly recites:

A method of providing services with a computer network that comprises a plurality of computing elements each of which comprise computing resources for supporting one or more services, and a redirector, communicatively connected to each of said computing elements; said method comprising:
receiving an e-mail message addressed to one of said computing elements for controlling a service; and
routing at least some of said e-mail message to a corresponding computing element with said redirector that is configured to function as an e-mail proxy for said computing elements.
(emphasis added).

In contrast, Motoyama does not teach or suggest a redirector configured to serve as an email proxy for a plurality of computing elements as claimed. The Office Action, on this point, cites Motoyama at col. 6, line 58 *et seq.* This portion of Motoyama merely describes assigning an email address to the various devices shown in Fig. 1 (e.g., printer (32), fax machine (28), etc.). In pertinent part, the cited portion of Motoyama states:

FIG. 5 illustrates a flowchart containing a process which is performed for a new machine such as a business office device in order to have it properly recognized by diagnostic, monitoring, and control equipment. After starting, step 250 has a user or device assign a name and address to the machine. In order for the device to transmit or receive communications, it is necessary to know where to send the communication and from where the communication originates. Step 252 stores the name and address in the semi-static state memory such as the flash memory 178 or the disk 182 illustrated in FIG. 3. This information is used both for a connection-mode of communication via a telephone or ISDN line, a connectionless-mode of communication such as using a conventional Internet electronic mail protocol, and also to have communication to the machine for ordinary purposes such as using the digital copier/printer for printing jobs via the local area network.

100200239-1

10/052,612

Once the information for the machine has been determined and then stored in step 252, it is necessary to register this information so that other devices will be able to access the machine. Therefore, the name and address of this device are registered in a mail server, for example, which will send and receive electronic mail for the network to which the mail server is connected. It is also desirable to register the machine as part of the local area network. Further, the monitoring devices to which the machine transmits messages are registered with the machine. Last, the machine is registered with a computer of a customer service department or other remote monitoring, controlling and/or diagnosing computer in order for the remote device to properly monitor and be aware of the existence of the machine. Step 256 sends a message to a service department or one of the other divisions illustrated in FIG. 1 in order to register the name, address, model number, serial number, or other information and capabilities of the machine in the customer service or another type of data base. Motoyama at col. 6, line 58 *et seq.*

Thus, Motoyama does not teach or suggest a redirector, or method involving a redirector, as claimed. Rather, Motoyama describes a system, without a redirector, in which devices are each assigned an address, and email is routed through a mail server directly to or from the addressed device. There is no mention or suggestion of a device, such as the claimed redirector, that serves as a "proxy" for the various devices. Reference to Applicant's Fig. 5 and claim 7, for example, will demonstrate that the redirector (51) and mail server (22) are different devices serving different functions.

"A claim is anticipated [under 35 U.S.C. § 102] only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Consequently, because Motoyama fails to teach or suggest the claimed "redirector," or method using the same, the rejection of all claimed based on Motoyama should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The various dependent claims of the application recite additional features that are neither taught nor suggested by Motoyama or the other prior art references of record. For

100200239-1

10/052,612

example, claim 3 recites that the redirector "comprises a mail router." Claim 12 recites similar subject matter in the form of a method claim. Claim 4 recites that the redirector comprises a service handler for extracting an access function from incoming email. Claim 13 recites similar subject matter in the form of a method claim. Claim 7 recites a mail server working with the redirector. Claim 16 recites similar subject matter in the form of a method claim. Claim 10 recites that the redirector generates web pages related to the services available. Claim 18 recites similar subject matter in the form of a method claim.

Because Motoyama does not teach or suggest the claimed redirector, Motoyama cannot teach or suggest the features of any of these dependent claims or claims that depend therefrom. For at least these additional reasons, the rejection of at least claims 3-7, 10 and 12-19 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 8 and 9 were rejected under § 103(a) over the teachings of Motoyama taken alone. Claims 4-6, 10, 13-15 and 19-20 were rejected under § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Motoyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,480,901 to Weber et al. ("Weber"). As demonstrated above, Motoyama fails to teach or suggest the claimed redirector or any features thereof.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). Consequently, these rejections under § 103 are respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons given above, for example, with respect to independent claims 1 and 11 and the various dependent claims discussed.

100200239-1

10/052,612

New Claims:

Newly added claims 22-25 are thought to be patentable for the same reasons given above for the original independent claims by virtue of the dependence of claims 22-25 on original claim 1.

Newly added claims 26-29 are thought to be patentable over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons. New claim 26 recites:

A computer network for providing services comprising:
a plurality of computing elements each of which comprises computing resources for supporting one or more services; and
a service handler on at least one of said computing elements for obtaining a service using an incoming email and loading and invoking that service on the computing element corresponding to the service handler.

In contrast, Motoyama, for example, teaches computing elements that receive commands by email, but does not teach or suggest a network in which email is used to load and invoke a new service on a computing element. Therefore, examination and allowance of the newly added claims is respectfully requested.

100200239-1


10/052,612

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 11 May 2005



Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number 703-872-9308 on May 11, 2005. Number of Pages: 19


Rebecca R. Schow